

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of
CHRISTOPH GERARD AUGUST HOELEN ET AL.

Atty. Docket: NL 020264

Confirmation No. 8032

Serial No. 10/509,409

Group Art Unit: 2885

Filed: SEPTEMBER 23, 2004

Examiner: LEE, Y MY QUACH

Title: COMPACT LIGHTING SYSTEM AND DISPLAY DEVICE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on March 5, 2007
and May 14, 2007, please consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

Appellants maintain the arguments submitted in the Appeal Brief filed on December 12, 2006, which are incorporated herein by reference. Further, Appellants refute the allegations made in the Examiner's Answer of March 7, 2007, and May 14, 2007.

In particular, Appellants respectfully refute the allegation that U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0137821 (Gotoh) is a prior art reference. The present application was PCT filed on March 21, 2003 and claims the benefit of a European Patent Application filed on March 28, 2002, which is thus the effective filing date of the present application.

As the effective filing date of the present application of March 28, 2002 is before the Gotoh U.S. filing date of October 4, 2002, Gotoh is not available as prior art with regard to the present application under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-3, 7-9 and 13-16 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent Claim 1.

In addition, Appellants deny any statement, position or


averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Appellants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 13-16 are patentable over Lee and Ohno.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Appellants
May 29, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101